

Lawless, Forbidden and Abominable Customs: *О Латинѣхъ сирѣчь Фроугохъ*, a Slavonic list of Latin errors¹

Lara Sels (Katholieke Universiteit Leuven / Universiteit Gent)

The present article deals with Byzantine and Slav perceptions of Western otherness, in particular in *О Латинѣхъ сирѣчь Фроугохъ*, a crude enumeration of twenty-seven complaints about Latin customs and beliefs that is found in a number of South Slavonic manuscripts of the fifteenth century. An outline will be given of the broader tradition of virulently anti-Latin *opuscula* in which the Slavonic list under scrutiny is to be situated, after which follows a source-critical analysis of the list's content and structure in light of some of its Greek precedents, especially the *Opusculum contra Francos*, Cerularius' letter to Peter of Antioch and the so-called *First* and *Second anonymous*. The twenty-seven accusations against the Christians of the West are shown to have been taken from three different sources and to have been compiled at random, without any effort to make the whole stylistically homogeneous or consistent in content. It is argued that *О Латинѣхъ* is a typical specimen of its genre, precisely because of its compound nature, its lack of an ordering principle and the absence of any theological argumentation.

In recent publications Raymond Detrez argued convincingly for the existence of a collective 'Romaic' consciousness in the Christian population of the Ottoman Balkans, a consciousness informed primarily by religious – rather than ethnic or national – self-identification (Detrez 2010; 2013). Even if, as argued, the incorporation of the Orthodox

¹ A list of abbreviations is appended at the end of the article.

Christian community into the Ottoman *millet* system was formative for that consciousness, medieval Byzantine Christian universalism had paved the way. Resulting from a blend of influences from the Roman imperial tradition (cf. the self-appellation ‘Rhomaioi’), the Hellenistic idea of a Greek-speaking cultural community (and the ‘barbaroi’ outside of it), and the Christian idea of a universal empire on earth as an image of the Heavenly Kingdom (cf. Obolensky 2000: 272-275), this particular Byzantine form of self-consciousness was typically tied up with conceptions of otherness to which cultural and religious considerations were at least as important as the ethnic criterion. Henry Chadwick rightly points out that “[r]eligion when shared is one of the strongest of social bonds” (2003: 1), only to proceed to describe how Eastern Christians – self-perceived heirs of Rome and keepers of the true Christian tradition – gradually came to perceive Western Christianity as a separate body. In the late Byzantine period ‘Latins’ or ‘Franks’ were to many just as ‘Other’ as Muslims or Jews. However, the demand for uniformity in the expression of the faith was not always, not everywhere and not for everyone equally stringent and the emphasis in the perception of Latin error – e.g., the double procession of the Holy Spirit, the use of unleavened bread or *azyma* in the Eucharist, the primacy of the Petrine See, etc. – changed considerably between the ninth and the fourteenth centuries (see esp. Kolbaba 2001).

The Latin Error Lists

A window, admittedly limited and biased, on the Byzantine perception of Western otherness is offered by the Byzantine lists of Latin errors, a text type examined in depth for the first time in a monograph by Tia Kolbaba (2000). The lists are definitely not the most lofty and erudite specimen of Byzantine writing, even if they are often linked to Photius of Constantinople’s (patriarch 858-867 and 877-886) Encyclical Letter to the Eastern Sees of early 867, which deals with five complaints about Latin customs, viz. Saturday fasting, certain Lenten observances, clerical celibacy, the Western rite of Confirmation and the procession of the Holy Spirit (*Filioque*) (ed. *Patrologia Graeca* 102: 721-741; Laourdas & Westerlinck 1983: 40-53). These complaints recur not only in later more learned refutations of Latin customs but also in virulently anti-Latin *opuscula* that bluntly enumerate accusations without reference or argumentation. The first real list, however, is to be sought in the letter to Patriarch Peter of Antioch (1052-1056) by Michael Cerularius (patriarch of Constantinople 1043-1058) (ed. *PG* 120: 789-794), whose clash with Cardinal Humbert of Silva Candida marked the so-called ‘great schism’ of

1054 (Chadwick 2003: 206-218).² Cerularius lists nineteen complaints dealing with dogma, liturgy and pastoral customs alike – going from the *Filioque* via the Eucharistic unleavened bread to remarks about the appearance and dietary customs of Western monks, priests and prelates. Later lists repeated and expanded the accusations. In spite of the more moderate voices of, for instance, Peter of Antioch (1052-1056) (cf., e.g., Chadwick 2003: 213-216), Theophylact of Ohrid (1088-9 – after 1126) (cf. Kolbaba 2000: 176, Chadwick 2003: 221) or Nicetas Seides (second half 11th, first half 12th c.) (cf. Darrouzès 1963: 52-53; Kolbaba 2000: 177), a tradition of ever-expanding, sharply polemical, gross and popular lists took off and proved tenacious.

The *Opusculum contra Francos*

One of these Latin error lists attracted considerable attention after its publication by Josef Hergenröther in 1869, viz. the so-called *Opusculum contra Francos*, (ed. Hergenroether 1869a: 62-71; comments Hergenröther 1869b: 172-224), probably written somewhere between the second half of the eleventh and the first half of the twelfth century (cf. Hergenröther 1869b: 224; Darrouzès 1963: 55-56; Kolbaba 2000: 178), and – in spite of its attribution to Photius in the Greek manuscripts – clearly fitting within the tradition of Cerularius' list.³ The introduction, aimed at presenting the “Franks, also called Germans” as barbarians and “strangers to the evangelical, apostolic and patristic traditions” (cf. Levy-Rubin 2001),⁴ is followed by twenty-eight accusations. Even if uncertainty remains concerning the exact date and the original state of the text, as well as concerning its influence on other lists, it is absolutely clear that the text group to which the *Opusculum* belongs was extremely influential, both in the East and in the West. The same complaints recur in many other lists, often in combination with

² It is generally acknowledged that the mutual excommunications of the papal legate and the patriarch were not much more than “another signpost on the road that eventually led to schism”, viz. in the aftermath of the Crusades and esp. of the capture of Antioch (Gallagher 2008: 595-596; cf. Chadwick 2003: 218; Levy-Rubin 2001: 434-435).

³ Darrouzès rightly remarks: “[...] ce genre littéraire lui-même paraît en soi étranger à la culture littéraire du patriarcat [Photius]” (1963: 56). For an attempt to ascribe the list to Archbishop Leo of Ochrid (1036-1056), see Snopek (1908); obviously erroneous is the suggestion of Cyril, bishop of Turov (1169-1182), made by Biener (1827: 68-69).

⁴ The earliest datable attestation of a such introductory claim seems to be found in Nikon of the Black Mountain's *Taktikon*, written shortly after the conquest of Antioch by the Crusaders in 1098 (Levy-Rubin 2001: 425-426). “The claim is that these are in fact heresies, which originated in barbarian peoples who took the place of the ancient Romans. Hence, now, both strings tying East and West are finally torn: there is no Romanitas to unite us, because they are not Romans, they are barbarians. There is no Christian fraternity, because they have always been heretics” (Levy-Rubin 2001: 435).

material from Cerularius' letter.⁵ Lists that belong to the same family are the ones by John of Claudiopolis (fl. 1166) (Darrouzès 1963: 53; Kolbaba 2000: 177, 185; partial ed. Pavlov 1878: 189-191), which is the earliest to contain a number of accusations that recur in the *Opusculum*; the one by Constantine Stilbes (fl. 1182-1204) (ed. Darrouzès 1963: 61-91; see also Kolbaba 2000: 178-179, 185-186), the most elaborate of its kind with a total of seventy-five accusations;⁶ and finally the list in verse composed by Meletius Galesiotes Homologetes (ca. 1209-1286) (ed. Kolbaba 1997: 144-150).⁷

The Slavonic Lists

Anti-Catholic texts strongly appealed to the Slavs as well and a substantial corpus of Byzantine writings against the Latins circulated in Slavonic translation. The 'error lists' had a considerable resonance in Russia (as is clear from Popov 1875 and Pavlov 1878; see also Podskalsky 1982: 170-184), where compendia based on Cerularian accusations and complaints taken from the pseudo-Photian *Opusculum* were integrated into polemical texts and found their way into larger collections such as the Kievan Patericon and the *Nomocanon* (*Kormčaja kniga*).⁸ A list of thirty-five items erroneously ascribed to Gregory Camblak (ed. Popov 1875: 320-325; cf. Podskalsky 2000: 142-142, 257-258) is an example of a conflation of existing Slavonic translations of Cerularius' letter and the *Opusculum*, supplemented by three accusations taken from a text on the schism, viz. *A Useful Tale About the Latins* (ed. Nikolov 2011; for the list: 73, 82, 89-90, 95, 103) (cf. Thomson 1998: 97-98; 2005: 517). It should not come as a surprise that a Slavonic version of the *Opusculum* itself, close to Hergenröther's Greek text, is also found in Andrej Popov's (1841-1881) pioneering work on the old Russian polemical corpus (1875: 58-69), based on copies of the *Nomocanon* (the earliest of which are of the thirteenth century).

⁵ On several anonymous twelfth-century lists see Darrouzès (1963: 52); there are also parallels with chapter 38 of Nikon of the Black Mountain's *Taktikon* (Levy-Rubin 2001: 424-425).

⁶ Stilbes adds a list of twenty-nine atrocities committed by the Latins in 1204 when they sacked Constantinople.

⁷ Meletius' 'Λόγος ὁ περὶ τῶν ἡθῶν τῶν Ἰταλῶν' is actually the first item of the third book of an extended poem on Orthodox spirituality. The list belongs to the family of the *Opusculum contra Francos* more in content than in form, as it is written in verse and lacks literal correspondences to other lists (Kolbaba 1997: 127-142).

⁸ See, for instance, George of Kiev's treatise against the Latins (Podskalsky 1982: 172-174; ed. Pavlov 1878: 191-198) or the polemical letters by Metropolitan Nicephorus I (cf. Podskalsky 1982: 177-179, and Popov 1875: 110-116; ed. Mil'kov 2007: 312-322, 363-369, 393-400, 433-452, 469-479); also *On the Beliefs of the Latins* by Theodosius the Greek, extant in various redactions (Podskalsky 1982: 181-184; ed., e.g., Makarij 1856: 215-223, and Erëmin 1935: 34-38) and also found in the *Kiev Patericon* (ed. Tschizewskij 1964: 190-192) and the *Nomocanon* (cf. Kalačev 1847: 22 n°7).

On the Latins, that is, the Franks

While the anti-Latin writings in the old Russian tradition have received some scholarly attention, the South Slavonic polemical corpus has remained under-researched. However, the polemical collections by the famous fifteenth-century scribe Vladislav Grammaticus – viz. in codex 3/111 of the Odessa State Library (1456)⁹ and codex III.a.47 of the Croatian Academy of Arts and Sciences in Zagreb (1469) – have been the object of some scholarly comments (e.g., Podskalsky 2000: 265; Dujčev, 1970-72: 182-189; Dančev 1969: 33-41, 54-56, esp. 54). One of the polemical works found in these collections, viz. on ff. 32^v-36^r in the Odessa folia and on ff. 538^r-540^r of the voluminous codex kept at Zagreb (cf. Christova 1996: 19 and 36; Sels 2009: 25-26), is a Slavonic list of twenty-seven Latin errors with as a title *О Латинѣхъ сирѣчь Фроузохъ*, of which two earlier copies can be found on ff. 194^v-198^v of the *Codex chilandarius* 405 (c. 1400) and on ff. 189^r-193^v of the *Codex bijelopoliensis* 48 (c. 1430/40) (cf. Sels 2009: 22-23).¹⁰ The text has been readily identified as a second translation of the pseudo-Photian *Opusculum contra Francos* (Sels 2009: 22) but it is actually more difficult to give an adequate definition of the list under scrutiny. First, the list itself is preceded by an explanatory introduction¹¹ that contains curious folk etymologies for “Ionia”, “Hellas” and “Longobards”¹² and for which a unique Greek parallel is found in the *Codex Monacensis* 551, under the title *Περὶ γενεῶν* on ff. 108^v l. 26 – 109^r l. 17 (cf. Hergenröther 1869b: 181 nt. 30-32).¹³ Furthermore, it is clear that the Slavonic list depends on the pseudo-Photian *Opusculum* for only part of its arguments. A parallel for some of the complaints can be found in a Greek list of thirty-eight errors, commonly referred to as “second anonymous” (An2), found in the *Codex*

⁹ Viz. 15(41) according to the old numbering in Močul'skij (1890: 26-29) and *not* codex 1/112, or 12(38) in Močul'skij (1890: 18-21), as erroneously stated in Christova 1996: 7 and repeated in Sels 2009: 24. The Odessa folia were originally part of codex 4/14 of the Monastery of St John of Rila.

¹⁰ This list of four manuscripts (which all contain copies of the Slavonic *Hexaameron corpus* and were therefore used for the author's PhD-research) does not pretend to be exhaustive (see, e.g., another copy in Močul'skij 1890: 22).

¹¹ Originally undoubtedly a note to the expression “ὅσοι τοῦ μέρους τῆς δύσεως χριστιανοὶ ἔξωθεν τοῦ Ἰωνίου κόλπου” at the beginning of the *Opusculum contra Francos*.

¹² Ionia is claimed to have been named after its first inhabitant, Ionos (Ἰωνος, Ионъ), and Hellas after Ionos' son Elaionos (Ἐλαιῶνος, Еленъ). The word “Longobards” is said to derive from the names Bar (Βαρ, Баръ) and Longa (Λόγγα, Лерра), the alleged founder of Bari and his wife. The couple is said to have had five sons, viz. Kale, Ser, Melphe, Baion and Arban, whose offspring – Calabrians, Serbians, Melpians (Amalfitans), Venetians, and Arbanites – are called Longobards.

¹³ Unfortunately, the München codex does not agree with the Slavonic in the rest of its text.

graecus II/4836 of the Belgian Royal Library in Brussels¹⁴ (ed. Davreux 1935: 103-106); items 1-19 of *An2* are taken from Cerularius while 20-39 belong to the same textual family as the *Opusculum*. The so-called “first anonymous” (*An1*), which is also relevant to *О Латинѣхъ*, is an interpolated version of Cerularius, with some verbatim repetitions, some paraphrases and few additions (ed. Pavlov 1878: 151-157; cf. Kolbaba 2000: 175).

The scope of the present contribution does not allow for a commented edition of *О Латинѣхъ*. In what follows an analysis will be made of the list’s content and structure in the light of some of the Greek precedents. The following table contains a comparison of the wording and the distribution of each of the twenty-seven accusations of *О Латинѣхъ* with the items in the *Opusculum contra Francos* (*OcF*) – and in part in the Latin translation made in 1178 by the Pisan scholar Ugo Eteriano (1115-1182), which is published in parallel with the Greek by Hergenröther (1869a: 71). Whereas the earlier Slavonic translation of the *Opusculum* is referred to as *Slav1*, the list under scrutiny will be cited as *Slav2* (though it is not simply a second translation of *OcF*). Reference will be made to other Greek compendia of Latin errors, viz. Cerularius’ letter to Peter of Antioch (*Cer.*), *An1* and *An2*, John of Claudiopolis (*JoCl*), Constantine Stilbes (*Stilb.*) and Meletius Confessor (*Mel.*).

OcF: 1 / Slav2: 27

The Latins have added the Filioque to the creed (Kolbaba 2000: 40-1, 191; Hergenröther 1869b: 186-7). The double procession of the Holy Spirit – already for Photius ‘the crown of evils’ – is present in all subsequent lists of errors. The mention in *OcF* that the error is due to the inadequacy of the Latin language is a conventional explanation already found in Theophylact.¹⁵ The treatment of this item in *Slav2* – with its reproach that the Latins have added a fourth hypostasis to the Trinity – does not agree with any of the Greek sources used here.¹⁶

OcF: 2-3 / Slav2: ---

They use unleavened bread in the Eucharist (Kolbaba 2000: 37-39, 190; Hergenröther 1869b: 187). The complaint about azymes heads Cerularius’ list and remains a major item after

¹⁴ The manuscript (which was given to the Royal Library by the famous Ghent scholar Franz Cumont [1868-1947] who acquired it near Trebizond) is probably of the thirteenth century (cf. Davreux 1935: 106; Kolbaba 2000: 180).

¹⁵ The limitations of Latin as a theological language were claimed to have caused the distinction between procession (ἐκπόρευσις, viz. from the Father) and mission (ἀποστολή, by the Son) to be blurred, cf. Theophylact (Gautier 1980: 257).

¹⁶ The treatment of the *Filioque* is atypical of the lists, which usually simply enumerate errors without any theological argumentation. This points to another type of source, viz. a more elaborate theological treatise.

that. *OcF* adds that the Latins slander the Apostle Peter and the Holy Fathers by ascribing this tradition to them. Remarkably, *Slav2* does not contain the accusation, which seems to have been dropped together with the next, viz. that *their bishops go into battle* (Kolbaba 2000: 48-51; Hergenröther 1869b: 188), another Cerularian item.

OcF: 4 / Slav2: 1

They fast on Saturday (Kolbaba 2000: 34-35, 189; Hergenröther 1869b: 189-190). Saturday fasting (perceived as a reflection of Jewish Sabbath fast) is already mentioned by Photius and was included in almost every list after that (cf. canon 55 of the Council in Trullo). *OcF* adds that the Latins fast even if the Feast of the Nativity of Christ or the Feast of Epiphany falls on a Saturday. *Slav2* corresponds to *OcF*, but it adds a line saying that the Latins honour the Fast more than the Feast, which agrees with the text in *Codex Monacensis* 551, f. 109v, l. 8 (cf. Hergenröther 1869b: 189, nt. 20).¹⁷

OcF: 5 / Slav2: 2a

They delay the beginning of Lent until Ash Wednesday (Kolbaba 2000: 41-43, 191-192; Hergenröther 1869b: 190-193). Complaints about improper fasting during Lent go back to Photius and are omnipresent in the lists but this particular accusation can be traced back to *JoCl* (189/5). *Slav2* agrees with *OcF*.

OcF: 6 / Slav2: 2b

They do not respect Cheese-fare Week (the week before Quinquagesima) (Kolbaba 2000: 41-43, 191-2; Hergenröther 1869b: 192-3), which is another common complaint about Lenten fasting. The wording of *Slav2* is somewhat different from that of *OcF* and has no exact parallel in the sources used here.

OcF: 7 / Slav2: 3

They eat eggs, cheese and milk on Great (Maundy) Thursday and allow their children to eat milk and eggs every Sunday in Lent (Kolbaba 2000: 41-43, 191-2; Hergenröther 1869b: 193-4). *JoCl* is the first to combine these accusations (189/5), which are also found in *OcF* and *An2* (104/22). It is the latter that best matches *Slav2*.

¹⁷ However, the München codex ascribes the habit to a certain Sabbatius, a claim absent in this item in *Slav2*. See, however, *infra*, *Slav2* item 26.



OcF: 8 / Slav2: 4

They do not venerate icons (Kolbaba 2000: 51-52, 193-194; Hergenröther 1869b: 195). The failure to venerate icons is mentioned by Cerularius and recurs in many lists. *OcF* – paralleled by *Slav2* – elaborates on the subject, stating that the Latins do not have depictions of the acts of the Saints in their churches with the exception of sculpted images of the Crucifixion.

OcF: 9 / Slav2: 5

When they enter a church they prostrate themselves and trace a cross on the ground, then they kiss the ground before getting up (Kolbaba 2000: 53-54, 194; Hergenröther 1869b: 195-196). The complaint is found first in *JoCl* (189-190/7b); *Stilb.* makes clear why the practice is rejected by adding that, after getting up, the Latins tread on the cross (73/50) (cf. also canon 73 of the Council in Trullo). *An2* fails to mention the actual tracing of a cross – only the kissing of the ground (104/23) – but in places it parallels the wording of *Slav2* more closely than *OcF*, which suggests a translator's model with elements of both versions.

OcF: 10 / Slav2: 6



They call the Theotokos (or Deipara) 'Holy Mary' (Kolbaba 2000: 53, 194; Hergenröther 1869b: 196-197) – for the moderate Nicetas Seides one of only three accusations to be taken seriously, together with the *Filioque* and azymes (cf., e.g., Darrouzès 1963: 53). *Slav2* agrees with *OcF* and *An2* (104/24), which are almost identical.



OcF: 11 / Slav2: 7

Everyone irreverently enters the sanctuary, even during the Divine Service; women are seated on the bishop's throne (Kolbaba 2000: 58-61, 195; Hergenröther 1869b: 197). The accusation is first found in *JoCl* (190/9), whose text is similar to *OcF*, apart from the latter's sarcastic final clause "Thus they know how to distinguish between the sacred and the profane," which is found in *Slav2* as well. However, some of the wording in *Slav2* is closer to *An2* (104/25).

OcF: 12 / Slav2: 8

They eat unclean food (Kolbaba 2000: 35-37, 189-90; Hergenröther 1869b: 197-8). The accusation was first made by Cerularius, who mentions the eating of strangled beasts and of unclean meat. The complaint is repeated in almost every list, in short as in *An2* (103/2,4) or in a more elaborate form as in *JoCl* (189/4, 190/16). The *OcF* mentions "things killed by wild beasts, carcasses, blood, bears, beavers, jackals and other things,



even more foul and disgusting than these”. *Slav2* reflects a – apparently garbled – version of the same text.

OcF: --- / Slav2: 9

They bless (baptismal) water on Sundays with salt added to the water. Kolbaba (2000: 199) knows of only one occurrence of this complaint, viz. in *An2* (104/26), which corresponds exactly to *Slav2*.

OcF: 13 / Slav2: 10

Their bishops wear luxurious clothes, rings and gloves (Kolbaba 2000: 53, 61-62, 194, 195-1966, 197; Hergenröther 1869b: 198-201). While the reproach of bishops wearing rings dates back to Cerularius, and that of colourful silken robes to Theophylact (Gautier 1980: 249), the mention of gloves depicting on the right side a hand coming out of a cloud and on the left the Lamb of God is typical only of *OcF* – which fully agrees with *Slav2* – and *Stilb.* (77-78/63).

OcF: 14a / Slav2: 11

They do not perform Holy Baptism in the correct way (Kolbaba 2000: 43-44, 192; Hergenröther 1869b: 201-204). Complaints about incorrect baptismal practices go back to Photius and Cerularius. The accusations in *OcF* are close to those in *Stilb.* (65/19) – they both mention baptism with water only and complain that salt is put in the mouth of the baptized and that saliva is used for anointment. The combination of similar claims is already found in *JoCl* (190/10-11a). *Slav2* is different: it leaves out the accounts of the salt and the saliva and just mentions baptism with a single immersion and with water only and no oil. Some of the words clearly reflect *An2* (104/15-16; esp. νεοφώτιστος – новопросвѣщенъ), which, however, is different (e.g., in that it mentions the saliva anointment).

OcF: 14b / Slav2: 12

The baptized are anointed at a more advanced age to obtain absolution for their sins (Kolbaba 2000: 43-44, 192; Hergenröther 1869b: 201-204). The complaint about Confirmation is already found in *JoCl* (190/11b). *OcF* – as *Stilb.* (65/20) – mentions that it is considered a second baptism. The shorter formula in *Slav2* fully agrees with *An2* (104/ 27).

OcF: 15 / Slav2: 13a

They practice Judaic purification rites (Kolbaba 2000: 66, 197; Hergenröther 1869b: 204). A very close parallel to *OcF* is *Stilb.* (67/26). *Slav2* seems to reflect a middle ground between the short sentence in *An2* (104/28) and the more elaborate accusation in *OcF*.



OcF: 16 / Slav2: 13b

They make the sign of the cross in a wrong way (Kolbaba 2000: 54, 194-195; Hergenröther 1869b: 204). OcF states that the cross is made with five fingers and that a sign on the face is made with the thumb, as in JoCl (190/13) and Stilb. (69/35). Slav2 agrees more closely with An2 (105/30), which mentions making the cross “with the big finger” (“μετὰ τοῦ μεγάλου δακτυλίου” – Slav2: “съ великимъ пръстомъ”) and then making a sign on the face with the thumb (“μετὰ τοῦ ἀντιχείρου” – Slav2: “съ палцемъ”).¹⁸

OcF: 17 / Slav2: 14

They do not chant the Alleluja during Lent (Kolbaba 2000: 48, 193; Hergenröther 1869b: 204-205). Kolbaba points out that the objection existed already in Cerularius’ time. Later instances of the accusation are, e.g., JoCl (189/6) and Stilb. (74/51). In Slav2 the reproach is supplemented by the statement that Latins do not venerate the icons either “saying that Christ is now in the desert”, which corresponds exactly to the text in An2 (105/31).

OcF: 18 / Slav2: 15a

They do not accept married priests (Kolbaba 2000: 39-40, 190-191; Hergenröther 1869b: 205-206). The prohibition of clerical marriage is one of the complaints that recur in all the lists. In OcF it is claimed that the Latins make men divorce their wives to become priests but that they do not follow their own rule. Slav2 links the prohibition of clerical marriage to adultery and clerical concubinage, as does An2 (105/32).

OcF: 19 / Slav2: 15b

They say that God should be praised only in Hebrew, Greek and Latin (Kolbaba 2000: 66-67, 197; Hergenröther 1869b: 206-208). OcF is the first list to include the accusation that the Latins defend trilinguism; it is repeated in An2 (105/33), the wording of which is slightly closer to Slav2.

OcF: 20 / Slav2: 16

They do not bury their bishops properly (Kolbaba 2000: 58, 195; Hergenröther 1869b: 208-209). The accusation is found in both OcF and An2 (105/34), which reproach the Latins for leaving their bishops unburied for eight days while people of the diocese come to salute the body and bring gifts. Again, Slav2 corresponds best to An2.

¹⁸ The Greek “μετὰ τοῦ μεγάλου δακτυλίου”, “with the big ring”, is clearly a mistake for “μετὰ τοῦ μεγάλου δακτύλου”, “with the big finger”, which apparently refers to the middle finger.



OcF: 21 / Slav2: 17

They celebrate mass more than once a day in the same church, or even in other places (Kolbaba 2000: 55-56, 195; Hergenröther 1869b: 209-212). *Slav2* agrees with *OcF*, to which *An2* (105/35) is also close.

OcF: 22 / Slav2: 18

They make exchanges in marriage (Kolbaba 2000: 44-46, 192; Hergenröther 1869b: 212). The complaint of *JoCl* (190/15) that a daughter from one family is given in marriage to another and that a daughter from that other family is then taken in exchange as a bride for members of the first family, is repeated in *OcF*. Again *An2* (105/36) is close to *OcF*, which corresponds fully with *Slav2*.

OcF: 23 / Slav2: 19

Bishops eat meat, and so do monks when they are ill; monks eat pig's fat even if they are healthy (Kolbaba 2000: 46-47, 193; Hergenröther 1869b: 212-214). The complaint that Western monks eat meat was already made by Cerularius, who is echoed in *An2* (103/7). The above, more elaborate accusations, however, are first found in *JoCl* (191/17) and then repeated in *OcF*, which agrees with *Slav2*.

OcF: 24 / Slav2: 20

The duration of Lent differs in different regions (Kolbaba 2000: 41-43, 191-192; Hergenröther 1869b: 214-219). The complaint in *OcF* recurs only in *Stilb.* (81/74) and *Mel.* (148/28). *Slav2* differs slightly from *OcF* and adds the formula "and everyone simply fasts as he pleases".

OcF: 25 / Slav2: 21

During Lent they hide the Cross together with the Alleluja, only to reveal it on Great (Holy) Saturday (Kolbaba 2000: 68, 197; Hergenröther 1869b: 219-220). The accusation is found only in *OcF* – to which *Slav2* corresponds – and in *Stilb.* (74/51) and *Mel.* (148/23).

OcF: 26 / Slav2: 22

They sit down and talk during the liturgy, even at the holiest moments (Kolbaba 2000: 63-64, 196; Hergenröther 1869b: 220-221). *Slav2* follows the slightly expanded version of *An2* (105/37) more closely than that of *OcF*.

OcF: --- / Slav2: 23a

Their priests shave just like lay men (Kolbaba 2000: 56-57, 195). Cerularius already mentions that Latin priests shave and his brief note is repeated in *An2* (103/3). The complaint is

not in the regular text of the *OcF* but it is in the Latin translation by Ugo Eteriano (Hergenroether 1869a: 71c). It is also present in *An1* (152/8a) and *Stilb.* elaborates on the item at great length (71/39, 78/65). However, there is no perfect match for *Slav2*.

***OcF*: --- / *Slav2*: 23b**

That two brothers marry two sisters (Kolbaba 2000: 44-46, 192-193; cf. canon 54 of the Council in Trullo). This is another Cerularian item which, however, does not recur in *An2*. It is found in *An1* (152/11) and in Ugo Eteriano's version of the *OcF* (Hergenroether 1869a: 71b); *Mel.* also mentions it (149/37).

***OcF*: [27] / *Slav2*: 23c**

A celebrant takes Communion and embraces the others, who think that in this way they partake in the Communion (Kolbaba 2000: 54-55, 195; Hergenröther 1869: 221). Again, this is a Cerularian item, repeated in *An1* (151-152/4) in a formulation similar to that in *Slav2*. *OcF* has the complaint about the embrace as well (70/27), but the wording is different; it recurs in *An2* (105/38) in a version corresponding to a second occurrence of the item in *Slav2* (cf. *Slav2* 24, *infra*).

***OcF*: --- / *Slav2*: 23d**

They do not honour the relics of the saints (Kolbaba 2000: 198). Again an accusation from Cerularius' list (where it is mentioned together with the following item concerning icons), a parallel of which is found in both *An1* (153/17a) and *An2* (104/18).

***OcF*: --- / *Slav2*: 23e**

They do not venerate icons (Kolbaba 2000: 51-52, 193-194; Hergenröther 1869b: 195). The same reproach worded differently occurs earlier in *Slav2* (cf. *Slav2* 4, *supra*), but here it is found in its concise Cerularian form, linked closely to the previous complaint about relics. It is echoed in both *An1* (153/17b) and *An2* (104/19a).

***OcF*: --- / *Slav2*: 23f**

They have added the phrase "with the Holy Spirit" to the "One Holy, One Lord..." (viz. the "Gloria in excelsis" or "Hymn of the Angels") (Kolbaba 2000: 65, 196). The accusation stems from Cerularius, where it is mentioned in the context of the baptismal rites. It is found in *An1* (151/2) and *An2* (104/10), as well as in *Stilb.* (61/2).

OcF: 27 / Slav2: 24

Instead of giving the Communion the celebrant embraces the one who wants to partake in the Communion (Kolbaba 2000: 54-55, 195; Hergenröther 1869b: 221). This repeated complaint (cf. *supra*, Slav2 23c) parallels the elaborate formulation in An2 (105/38).

OcF: 28 / Slav2: 25

They perform Ordination only four times a year (Kolbaba 2000: 65-66, 196; Hergenröther 1869b: 221-223). In the OcF this is by far the most lengthy complaint, with its description of the division of the year according to the seasons and the ordination of priests and deacons on the first Wednesday and of bishops on the first Saturday of March, June, September or December. Slav2 has the same complaint but its wording is different and it has another ending with an additional accusation of magical practices. In some regards its text is closer to that of An2 (105-106/39), in others to OcF.

OcF: [4] / Slav2: 26

They have taken up Saturday fasting under the influence of a certain Sabbatius, thinking that Peter rebuked Simon the Magician on that day (Acts 8:9-24), but they were led astray by the heretics Eutyches, Dioscurus, Magnentius, Macedonius, Sabellius and Timothy-Aelurus. No similar passage is found in the Greek sources used here, though Sabbatius is mentioned in the Codex Monacensis 551 as well (cf. *supra*, note 17) and the reference to Simon Magus is found in one of the polemical letters of the Russian metropolitan Nicephorus I (cf. note 8; Mil'kov 2007: 394, 440, 471).

In the next table, correspondences between Slav 2 and its sources' OcF and An2 are indicated by dark or light grey shading of the cells; numbers in square brackets in the same row indicate that the same item has been treated or worded differently. Part of the list has additional cells to indicate correspondence to Cer. and An1.

OcF	Slav2	An2
Gr & Slav1		
Intro	Intro & Περὶ γενεῶν	---
4	1	[6]
5	2a	---

[6]	2b	[8]
7	3	22
8	4	[19a]
9	5	23
10	6	24
11	7	25
12	8	[2,4]
---	9	26
13	10	[12-13]
[14a]	11	[15-16]
[14b]	12	27
15	13a	28
[16]	13b	30
[17]	14	31
[18]	15a	32
19	15b	33
20	16	34
21	17	35
22	18	36
23	19	[7]
24	20	---
25	21	---
26	22	37

---	23a	[3]	<i>Cer. 3; An1 8a</i>
---	23b	---	<i>Cer. 12; An1 11</i>
--- [27]	23c	[38]	<i>Cer. 13; An1 4</i>
---	23d	[18]	<i>Cer. 17; An1 17a</i>
--- [8]	23e	[19a]	<i>Cer. 18; An1 17b</i>
---	23f	[10]	<i>Cer. 10; An1 2</i>
[27]	24	38	
28	25	39	
--- [4]	26	[6]	
[1]	27	[9]	

Obviously, *Slav2* – or *О Латинѣхъ* – is nothing more than a crude enumeration of complaints about Latin customs and beliefs taken from various sources and compiled at random without any effort to make the whole stylistically homogeneous and consistent in content. The Slavonic list is most likely a translation of a Greek list with the same features, although the possibility that the translator had some part in the compilation of the items cannot be excluded. The source text of *О Латинѣхъ* clearly draws on both the *OcF* and *An2*; roughly speaking items 1-22 and 24-25 are a conflation of *OcF* 4-28 and *An2* 22-39. Complaints 23a-f clearly have another source; they are Cerularian items also found in *An1*, clearly set apart from the rest of the complaints by their typical *сже* + infinitive structure, which reflects the concise Cerularian wording with its enumeration of infinitives. It is remarkable that one of the most popular accusations, viz. that on azymes (*OcF* 2), is missing. The fact that the complaint about bishops going into battle (*OcF* 3) has been dropped as well suggests a mechanical omission at some stage in the tradition. The omission probably occurred after the conflation of *OcF* and *An2*; otherwise the two missing accusations could have been supplied from the latter (*An2* 1 and 14). It is even probable that the omission included the first item of the *OcF* as well, viz. the *Filioque*, as it seems to have been supplied at the end of *О Латинѣхъ* as item twenty-seven from another source, most likely not an error list (cf. *supra*, note 16). It seems probable that the preceding item twenty-six on Saturday fasting has been taken from that same source. The use of various sources caused two items to be included in *О Латинѣхъ* twice, viz. the complaints about the celebrant's embrace (items 23c and 24) and about Saturday fasting (items 1 and 26).

Conclusions

This preliminary examination of *О Латинѣхъ*, a typical specimen of its genre precisely because of its compound structure and its “general lack of order and definition” (Kolbaba 2000: 33), enables some conclusions to be drawn. Three different sources apparently lie at the basis of this list, which is either a translation of an untraced Greek list or a Slav compilation, viz. 1) a conflation of *OcF* and *An2* that had probably lost its first three items, 2) a list of the Cerularian family close to *An1*, and 3) an unidentified, more elaborate, probably late and conflated anti-Latin treatise. The partial identification of the Greek sources makes it possible to assert that it is a literal translation, typical of the fourteenth-century, a dating that is not contradicted by the textual tradition. The translation typifies the period after Michael Palaeologus’ failed attempts to negotiate a Church Union, a time of fierce anti-Latin sentiments, especially in the Greek and Slav monasteries of Mount Athos, where the already extant hostility was sharpened by the Palamite controversy. It was also the time of the Ottoman advance into Europe. Many ‘Latins’ were reluctant to join a crusade to help the subjects of the threatened Empire of the East. Some conveniently preferred to consider the Eastern Christians as dissident schismatics – just as ‘Other’ as Muslims or Jews.

List of abbreviations

<i>An1</i>	First anonymous list (ed. ed. Pavlov 1878: 151-157)
<i>An2</i>	Second anonymous list (ed. Davreux 1935: 103-106)
<i>Cer.</i>	Cerularius’ letter to Peter of Antioch (ed. <i>Patrologia Graeca</i> 120: 789-794)
<i>JoCl</i>	List by John of Claudiopolis (partial ed. Pavlov 1878: 189-191)
<i>Mel.</i>	List by Meletius Galesiotes Homologetes (ed. Kolbaba 1997: 144-150)
<i>OcF</i>	<i>Opusculum contra Francos</i> (ed. Hergenroether 1869a: 62-71)
<i>Slav1</i>	Slavonic translation of <i>OcF</i> (ed. Popov 1875: 58-69)
<i>Slav2</i>	<i>О Латинѣхъ сирѣчь Фроузохъ</i> (<i>On the Latins, that is the Franks</i> ; unedited)
<i>Stilb.</i>	List by Constantine Stilbes (ed. Darrouzès 1963: 61-91)

Bibliography

- Biener, Friedrich August
1827 *De collectionibus canonum Ecclesiae Graecae schediasma litterarium*. Berlin: Typis academiae regiae scientiarum.
- Chadwick, Henry
2003 *East and West: The Making of a Rift in the Church. From Apostolic Times Until the Council of Florence*. Oxford: OUP.
- Christova, Borjana
1996 *Opis na rãkopisite na Vladislav Gramatik*. Veliko Tãrnovo: PIK.
- Dančev, Georgi
1969 *Vladislav Gramatik, knižovnik i pisatel*. Sofija: Izdatelstvo na Bãlgarskata akademija na naukite.
- Darrouzès, Jean
1963 Le mémoire de Constantin Stilbès contre les Latins. *Revue des études byzantines* 21: 50-100.
- Davreux, Juliette
1935 Le Codex Bruxellensis (Graecus) II 4836 (De Haeresibus). *Byzantion* 10: 91-106.
- Dujčev, Ivan
1970-72 Propaganda anticattolica a Novo Brdo (Serbia) nel secolo XV. *Ricerche slavistiche* 17-19 [1970-72 but published 1973]: 179-190.
- Detrez, Raymond
2010 Understanding the pre-national(ist) Balkans: The 'Romaic' community. In: Paschalis Kitromilides & Anna Tabaki (eds.), *Greek-Bulgarian Relations in the Age of National Identity Formation*: 21-69. Athens: Institute for Neohellenic Research.
- 2013 Pre-National Identities in the Balkans. In: Roumen Daskalov and Tchavdar Marinov (eds.), *Entangled Histories of the Balkans* (vol. 1: National Ideologies and Language Policies) (Balkan Studies Library 9): 13-65. Leiden: Brill.
- Erëmin, Igor' P.
1935 Iz istorii drevne-russkoj publicistiki XI veka. Poslanie Feodosija Pečerskogo k knjazju Izjaslavu Jaroslaviču o latinjanach. *Trudy otdela drevnerusskoj literatury* 2: 21-38.
- Gallagher, Clarence
2008 The Two Churches. In: Elizabeth Jeffreys, John Haldon & Robin Cormack (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Byzantine Studies*: 592-598. Oxford: OUP.
- Gautier, Paul
1980 *Théophylacte d'Achrida. Discours, traités, poésies. Theophylacti Achridensis Orationes, tractatus, carmina* (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae. Series Thessalonicensis 16/1). Thessalonique: Association de recherches byzantines.
- Hergenroether, Josef
1869a *Monumenta graeca ad Photium ejusque historiam pertinentia, quae ex variis codicibus manuscriptis collegit ediditque J. Hergenroether*. Ratisbona [Regensburg]: Georgius Josephus Manz.
- Hergenröther, Josef
1869b *Photius, Patriarch von Konstantinopel. Sein Leben, seine Schriften und das griechische Schisma. Nach handschriftlichen und gedruckten Quellen* (Bd. 3). Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft [1966 reprint of the edition of 1869, Regensburg].
- Kalačev, Nikolaj
1847 O značenii kormčej v sisteme drevnogo russkogo prava. Čtenija v Obščestve istorii i drevnostej rossijskich pri Moskovskom universitete 3/3 (16) i: 1-128 [reprinted as a book in 1850, Moskva: Universitetskaja tipografija].

- Kolbaba, Tia M.
 1997 Meletios Homologetes 'On the Customs of the Italians', *Revue des études byzantines* 55: 137-168.
 2000 *The Byzantine Lists: Errors of the Latins* (Illinois Medieval Studies). Urbana and Chicago: University of Illinois Press.
 2001 Byzantine Perceptions of Latin Religious 'Errors': Themes and Changes from 850 to 1350. In: A.E. Laiou & R.P. Mottahedeh (eds.), *The Crusades from the Perspective of Byzantium and the Muslim World*: 117-143. Washington: Dumbarton Oaks.
 Laourdas, Basil & Leendert Gerrit Westerink (eds.)
 1983 *Photius, Epistulae et Amphilochia* (vol. 1). Leipzig: Teubner.
 Levy-Rubin, Milka
 2001 'The Errors of the Franks' by Nikon of the Black Mountain: Between Religious and Ethno-Cultural Conflict. *Byzantion* 71: 422-437.
 Makarij [= Michail P. Bulgakov]
 1856 Sočinenija prepodobnogo Feodosija Pečerskogo v podlinnom tekste. *Učenyje zapiski vtorogo otdelenija Imperatorskoj akademii nauk* 2/2: 193-224.
 Mil'kov, Vladimir V., et al.
 2007 *Metropolit Nikifor* (Pamjatniki drevnerusskoj mysli. Issledovanija i teksty 5). Sankt-Peterburg: Mir.
 Močulskij, Viktor I.
 1890 *Opisanie rukopisej V.I. Grigoroviča*. Odessa: Tipo-litografija Štaba Odesskogo voennogo okruga.
 Nikolov, Angel
 2011 *Povest polezna za latinite. Pametnik na srednovekovnata slavjanska polemika sreštu katolicizma*. Sofija: PAM.
 Obolensky, Dimitri
 2000 *The Byzantine Commonwealth: Eastern Europe 500-1453* [1971]. London: Phoenix Press.
 Pavlov, Andrej S.
 1878 *Kritičeskie opyty po istorii drevnejšej greko-russkoj polemiki protiv latinjan*. Sankt-Peterburg: Tipografija Imperatorskoj Akademii nauk.
 Podskalsky, Gerhard
 1982 *Christentum und theologische Literatur in der Kiever Rus' (988-1237)*. München: C.H. Beck.
 2000 *Theologische Literatur des Mittelalters in Bulgarien und Serbien 865-1459*. München: C.H. Beck.
 Popov, Andrej N.
 1875 *Istoriko-literaturnyj obzor drevne-russkich polemičeskich sočinenij protiv latinjan (XI-XV v.)*. Moskva: T. Ris [reprint, with an introduction by Ivan Dujčev, London: Variorum Reprints, 1972].
 Sels, Lara
 2009 *Gregory of Nyssa. De hominis opificio. O obraze človeka. The Fourteenth-Century Slavonic Translation. A Critical Edition with Greek Parallel and Commentary* (Bausteine zur slavischen Philologie und Kulturgeschichte. Neue Folge. Reihe B: Editionen 21). Köln: Böhlau.
 Snopek, František
 1908 *Opusculum contra Francos*. In: F. Pastrnek (ed.), *Jagić-Festschrift. Zbornik u slavu Vatroslava Jagića*: 284-290. Berlin: Weidmann.
 Thomson, Francis J.
 1998 Gregory Tsamblak: The Man and the Myths. *Slavica Gandensia* 25/2: 5-149.
 2005 Mediaeval Bulgarian and Serbian Theological Literature: An Essential Vademecum, *Byzantinische Zeitschrift* 98/2: 503-549.
 Tschizewskij, Dmitrij
 1964 *Das Paterikon des Kiever Höhlenkosters, nach der Ausgabe von D. Abramovič* (Slavische Propyläen 2). München: Eidos.